Last updated: September 10th, 2025

Researched Persuasive Writing & Speaking

PLEASE NOTE THE FOLLOWING DIFFERENCES IN HOW THIS EVENT WILL BE RUN AT HOSA CANADA'S FALL LEADERSHIP CONFERENCE (FLC):

1. The Research Paper will be pre-judged using digital submissions at FLC. The submission link will be made available via the online course for this event. The submission deadline for FLC is 11:59 PM ET on October 31st, 2025.
2. Event will run according to the guidelines in the following pages, except that it will take place entirely online at FLC.
   **Students participating online will be expected to turn their cameras on for the entire duration of the event and show judges their surroundings to help minimize the occurrence of academic dishonesty.*
3. Students will be emailed their presentation time slots ahead of time at FLC only.

PLEASE NOTE HOSA CANADA'S SPRING LEADERSHIP CONFERENCE (SLC) WILL BE IN-PERSON AND THIS EVENT WILL BE RUN ACCORDING TO THE GUIDELINES IN THE FOLLOWING PAGES, EXCEPT FOR THE FOLLOWING DIFFERENCE:

1. The Research Paper will be pre-judged using digital submissions at SLC. The submission link will be made available via the online course for this event. The submission deadline for SLC is 11:59 PM ET on February 6th, 2026.

Researched Persuasive Writing and Speaking

Leadership Event .....

Eligible Divisions: Secondary & Postsecondary / Collegiate	**Pre-Judged:** pdf of Paper	**Digital Upload:** YES
Solo Event: 1 competitor	**Round 1:** Speech	

New for 2025 – 2026
Editorial updates have been made.

Event Summary
Researched Persuasive Writing and Speaking allows HOSA members to gain the knowledge and skills required to research a health issue, prepare written documentation supporting a thesis, and present information orally. This competitive event requires competitors to develop a speech and written paper, either for or against the provided annual health topic.

Topic for 2025-2026:
Is the Smartphone responsible for the current youth mental health crisis?

Dress Code
Proper business attire or official HOSA uniform. Bonus points will be awarded for proper dress.

Competitor Must Provide:
- Competitor uploads the paper to the HOSA Digital Upload System by May 15 for ILC competition (see advisor regarding SLC requirements and deadlines)
- Photo ID
- Index cards or electronic notecards (optional)

HOSA Conference Staff will provide equipment and supplies as listed in Appendix I.

General Rules
1. Competitors must be familiar with and adhere to the General Rules and Regulations.

The Research Paper - Pre-judged Digitally
2. The research paper will include the following four (4) pages:
   - A. Page 1 — Title Page
   - B. Pages 2 and 3 — Body of paper
   - C. Page 4+ (or more if reference list takes up multiple pages) — Reference page(s)

3. **Title Page:** Create a title page, including the following: Event name, Competitor Name, HOSA Division, HOSA Chapter #, School Name, Chartered Association, Title of Paper including Topic Stance, Title page centered, One page only. (A creative design or pictures may be used but will not affect the score.)

4. **Body of Paper** formatting:
   - A. Pages are one-sided, typed
   - B. 12 pt. Arial font, double-spaced, in English
   - C. 1" margins on 8 ½" x 11" paper
   - D. Running header with last name, & name of the event, on the top left side of each page (not counting title page)

E. Include the page number on the top right side of each page (not counting the title page)

5. **Reference Page:** List the literature cited to guide the written paper and speech. American Psychological Association (APA) is the preferred resource in Health Sciences. *Points will be awarded for compiling a clean, legible reference page(s), but the formatting of the reference page(s) is not judged.*

6. No plagiarism is allowed and work must be the competitor's per the GRR's.

REQUIRED Digital Uploads

7. The following item(s) **MUST** be uploaded to the HOSA Digital Upload System by May 15:
    a. The Research Paper – as a pdf file

    May 15 at midnight EST is the **final deadline,** and there will be **NO EXCEPTIONS** to receipt of the required materials after the deadline.

8. Detailed instructions for uploading materials can be found at:
    https://hosa.org/competitive-event-digital-uploads/

9. State Leadership Conference (SLC) vs. HOSA's International Leadership Conference (ILC)
    a. **State Leadership Conferences.** The competitor must check with their Local Advisor for all state-level processes used for competition, as digital uploads may or may not be a requirement.
    b. **International Leadership Conference.**
        i. If a competitor uses the HOSA Digital Upload System as a requirement at the SLC, the competitor **MUST upload an ADDITIONAL time for ILC by May 15.**
        ii. If the HOSA Digital Upload System is NOT used at the competitor's SLC, it is still the competitor's responsibility to upload the product for HOSA's ILC no later than May 15. Not using the HOSA Digital Upload System at a competitor's State Leadership Conference is not an exception to the rule.

10. The FINAL ILC digital upload deadline is May 15. We STRONGLY suggest not waiting until the last minute to upload online to avoid user challenges with the system.

11. For ILC, the digital materials uploaded by May 15 will be PRE-JUDGED. Competitors who do not upload materials are NOT eligible for the presentation portion of the competition and **will NOT be given a competition appointment time at ILC**. All digital content uploaded as of May 15 will be used for pre-judging at ILC.

The Speech

12. The speech may or may not be worded exactly as written in the researched written paper. The main ideas must remain the same, but the competitor may elaborate in the speech.
    NOTE: Competitors may choose to bring their paper to the ILC competition to reference during the speech, but no points are awarded on the rating sheet for doing so.

13. Use of index card notes during the speech is permitted. Electronic notecards (on a tablet, smartphone, laptop, etc.) are allowed but may **NOT** be shown to judges. Props may **NOT** be used.

14. The speech may be up to four (4) minutes in length. The timekeeper shall present a flash card advising the competitor when one (1) minute remains. The competitor will be stopped and dismissed when the four minutes are up.

Final Scoring

15. Scores from pre-judged papers will be added to the presentation score to determine the final results.

16. Should a tie occur, scores on the rating sheet section(s) with the highest point value(s) will be used in descending order to break the tie.

Future Opportunities

Graduating from high school or completing your postsecondary/collegiate program does not mean your HOSA journey has to end. As a HOSA member, you are eligible to become a HOSA Lifetime Alumni Member - a free and valuable opportunity to remain connected, give back, and help to shape the future of the organization. Learn more and sign up at hosa.org/alumni.

RESEARCHED PERSUASIVE WRITING AND SPEAKING
Pre-Judged Written Paper

Section # _____ Competitor # _____

Division: _____ SS _____ PS/C Judge's Signature _____

One PDF File of the completed paper Uploaded Online: Yes ___ No*

A. Written Paper	Excellent 10 points	Good 8 points	Average 6 points	Fair 4 points	Poor 0 points	JUDGE SCORE
1. Opening Statement	The writer grabs attention of the reader. The introduction is creative, imaginative, and thoughtful. The thesis clearly revealed and well-structured for the paper—forecasts body of paper memorably and effectively.	The writer somewhat grabs the reader's attention. The thesis is stated and appropriate for the paper. The forecast body so the audience knows the main points in brevity.	The audience is reading with some engagement. The thesis needs strength or structure. Forecast incomplete.	The attention device is unrelated to the topic. Thesis missing OR forecast statement missing.	Paper not submitted OR attention device is missing. Thesis inappropriate or missing AND forecast is missing or indistinguishable.	
2. Coverage of Assigned Event Topic and Quality of Information	The information included high-quality details that support the topic in a thorough manner. Research was in-depth and beyond the obvious, revealing new insights. Overall, the coverage of the assigned topic was excellent.	Information included sufficient detail relevant to the topic. Research seemed to be in-depth. The coverage of the assigned topic was good.	The quality of the information was limited to support the topic. The competitor provided an average amount of coverage on the assigned topic.	Some information provided was relevant to the topic. Research provided was mostly surface-level and the competitor missed key points.	Paper not submitted OR information was unreliable and interfered with ability of the audience to understand the speech. Research was irrelevant to the assigned topic.	
3. Originality	Writing reflects the original thoughts of the author and extends a creative or unique idea, question or concept on the topic. No evidence of plagiarism.	Writing reflects the original thoughts of the author and provides some unique ideas on the topic. No evidence of plagiarism.	Some original thoughts are provided by the author. Creativity is experimented with on the topic. No evidence of plagiarism.	Limited originality is provided by the author on the topic. No evidence of plagiarism.	Paper not submitted OR There was evidence of plagiarism.	
4. Conclusion	Conclusion is concise and summarizes supporting points: restates the thesis in a new way. The reader is satisfied with the conclusion and is left with something to think about.	Conclusion is mostly concise and summarizes the supporting points. The reader is indifferent with the conclusion of the essay.	Conclusion provides a summary of supporting points: it does not restate the thesis.	Conclusion may be attempted but does not summarize or restate thesis.	Paper not submitted OR no conclusion is apparent in the essay.	
A. Written Paper	**Excellent 20 points**	**Good 15 points**	**Average 10 points**	**Fair 5points**	**Poor 0 points**	**JUDGE SCORE**
5. Persuasiveness	The paper was exceptionally persuasive and convincing. The competitor provided well-researched evidence that reinforced their position on the topic.	The paper was persuasive and provided good reasons to agree with the competitor's point of view.	The paper was somewhat persuasive and provided some reasons to agree with the competitor's point of view.	The paper provided limited evidence of competitor's point of view and was not very persuasive.	Paper not submitted OR the paper was not persuasive and did not provide evidence to support the competitor's point of view.	

The expectation is that competitors read and are aware of all content within these guidelines and associated links. Successful competitors will study all links for detailed information.

A. Written Paper	Excellent 5 points	Good 4 points	Average 3 points	Fair 2 points	Poor 0 points	JUDGE SCORE
6. Title Page	Title Page includes Competitor Name, HOSA Division, HOSA Chapter #, School Name, Chartered Assoc, Title of Paper including Topic Stance, Title page centered, One page.	N/A	N/A	N/A	Paper not submitted OR title page does not include all requirements OR is not present.	
7. Transitions	Writing has voice and is easily read aloud. Appropriate transitions are used to move from one supporting detail to the next. Word choice and syntax offer surprise, clarity and "just right" wording.	Writing has some voice and is easily read aloud. Transitions are used, but better wording could have been used.	Vocabulary or writing style needs further development in sentence variety, word choice, and fluency. Some basic transitions used.	Sentences are short, fragmented or run-ons. Flow of essay is hard to follow. Few to no transitions are used.	Paper not submitted OR no flow to writing. Difficult for reader to follow. No transitions used	
8. Grammar	Zero (0) grammatical errors found in this essay.	1-2 grammatical errors were found in this essay. They do not detract from the general flow of the essay.	3-4 errors were found in the essay, and they detract from the overall flow of the essay.	There are 5-6 grammatical errors present which detract from the overall meaning and flow of the essay.	Paper not submitted OR more than 6 errors were found in this essay. The errors are glaring, and the essay is difficult to read.	
9. Spelling & Punctuation	Zero (0) errors in spelling and punctuation were found in this essay.	1-2 errors in spelling or punctuation were found in this essay.	3-4 errors in spelling or punctuation in this essay.	5 errors in spelling or punctuation were found in this essay.	Paper not submitted OR more than 5 errors in spelling or punctuation were documented within the essay.	
10. Formatting	Pages: a. Are one-sided, typed, b. Use 12 pt. Arial font, double-spaced, in English, c. Are 1" margins on 8 ½" x 11" paper, d. Use running header with last name, event on top left, and page number top right side of each page (not counting title page). e. Are no more than two for body of paper	N/A	N/A	N/A	Paper not submitted OR all requirements are not met.	
11.Reference Page	The reference page is included with the paper.	N/A	N/A	N/A	Paper not submitted OR no reference page is included.	
Subtotal Points for Pre-Judging Written Paper (90)						

The expectation is that competitors read and are aware of all content within these guidelines and associated links. Successful competitors will study all links for detailed information.

RESEARCHED PERSUASIVE WRITING AND SPEAKING
In-Person Speech

Section # _____ Competitor # _____

Division: _____ SS _____ PS/C Judge's Signature _____

B. Speech Content	Excellent 15 points	Good 12 points	Average 9 points	Fair 6 points	Poor 0 points	JUDGE SCORE
1. Introduction	The competitor grabs the attention of the audience in a way that is creative, imaginative and thoughtful. The thesis statement is clearly revealed and well-structured for speech.	The competitor draws in the audience with their introduction and piques their interest to want to learn more. The thesis statement connects to body of the speech.	The competitor provides an average introduction of the topic and slightly sparks the interest and attention of the audience.	The introduction provided by the competitor lacks attention to detail and connection to the overall point of the speech.	The competitor does not provide an introduction that draws in the audience and captures their attention.	
2. Overall coverage of assigned event topic and quality of information.	Information included high-quality details that support the event topic in a thorough manner. Research was in-depth and revealed new insights. Overall, the coverage of the assigned topic was excellent.	Information included sufficient detail relevant to the topic. Research seemed to be in-depth. The coverage of the assigned topic was good.	The quality of the information was limited to support the topic. The competitor provided an average amount of coverage on the assigned topic.	Some information provided was relevant to the topic. Research provided was mostly surface-level and the competitor missed key points of the assigned topic.	Information was unreliable and interfered with ability of the audience to understand the speech. Research was irrelevant to the assigned topic and the competitor missed the point of the topic.	
3. Conclusion	The competitor reviews the thesis and main points of speech in a memorable and effective way that provides an effective flow leading to the conclusion.	The competitor reviews the thesis and main points of speech in a clear way that provides an adequate flow leading to the conclusion.	The competitor reviews the thesis and main points clearly. Underwhelming conclusion.	The competitor is missing a review of the thesis or main points. The conclusion was hard to follow.	Review of the thesis and main points are missing from the conclusion.	
B. Speech Content	**Excellent 20 points**	**Good 15 points**	**Average 10 points**	**Fair 5 points**	**Poor 0 points**	**JUDGE SCORE**
4. Persuasiveness	The speech is exceptionally persuasive and convincing. The competitor provided well-researched evidence that reinforced their position on the topic.	The speech was persuasive and provided good reasons to agree with the competitor's point of view.	The speech was somewhat persuasive and provided some reasons to agree with the competitor's point of view.	The speech provided limited evidence of competitor's point of view and was not very persuasive.	The speech was not persuasive and did not provide evidence to support the competitor's point of view.	

The expectation is that competitors read and are aware of all content within these guidelines and associated links. Successful competitors will study all links for detailed information.

C. Speech Delivery	Excellent 5 points	Good 4 points	Average 3 points	Fair 2 points	Poor 0 points	JUDGE SCORE
1. Voice: Pitch, tempo, volume, quality	The competitor's voice was loud enough to hear. The competitor varied rate & volume to enhance the speech. Appropriate pausing was employed.	The competitor spoke loudly and clearly enough to be understood. The competitor varied rate OR volume to enhance the speech. Pauses were attempted.	The competitor could be heard most of the time. The competitor attempted to use some variety in vocal quality, but not always successfully.	Judges had difficulty hearing /understanding much of the speech due to little variety in rate or volume.	The competitor's voice is too low or monotone. Judges struggled to stay focused during most of the presentation.	
2. Stage Presence: Poise, posture, eye contact, and enthusiasm	Movements & gestures were purposeful and enhanced the delivery of the speech and did not distract. Body language reflects comfort interacting with audience. Facial expressions and body language consistently generated a strong interest and enthusiasm for the topic.	The competitor maintained adequate posture and non-distracting movement during the speech. Some gestures were used. Facial expressions and body language sometimes generated an interest and enthusiasm for the topic.	Stiff or unnatural use of nonverbal behaviors. Body language reflects some discomfort interacting with audience. Limited use of gestures to reinforce verbal message. Facial expressions and body language are used to try to generate enthusiasm but seem somewhat forced.	The competitor's posture, body language, and facial expressions indicated a lack of enthusiasm for the topic. Movements were distracting.	No attempt was made to use body movement or gestures to enhance the message. No interest or enthusiasm for the topic came through in presentation.	
3. Diction*, Pronunciation and Grammar** * Definition of Diction – Choice of words especially with regard to correctness, clearness, and effectiveness. ** Definition of Pronunciation – Act or manner of uttering officially.	Delivery emphasizes and enhances message. Clear enunciation and pronunciation. No vocal fillers (ex: "ahs," "uh/ums," or "you-knows"). Tone heightened interest and complemented the verbal message.	Delivery helps to enhance message. Clear enunciation and pronunciation. Minimal vocal fillers (ex: "ahs," "uh/ums," or "you-knows"). Tone complemented the verbal message	Delivery adequate. Enunciation and pronunciation suitable. Noticeable verbal fillers (ex: "ahs," "uh/ums," or "you-knows"). Tone seemed inconsistent at times.	Delivery quality minimal. Regular verbal fillers (ex: "ahs," "uh/ums," or "you-knows") present. Delivery problems cause disruption to message.	Many distracting errors in pronunciation and/or articulation. Monotone or inappropriate variation of vocal characteristics. Inconsistent with verbal message.	
					Subtotal Speech Points (80):	
					Total Points (Written Paper & Speech (170):	

The expectation is that competitors read and are aware of all content within these guidelines and associated links. Successful competitors will study all links for detailed information.